



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,209	06/29/2006	Keisuke Tsunetsugu	MAT-8743US	6767
53473	7590	07/28/2008		
RATNERPRESTIA P.O. BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482			EXAMINER THOMAS, ALEXANDER S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/552,209

Applicant(s)

TSUNETSUGU ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander Thomas

Art Unit

1794

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 17 and 22-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 17 and 22-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 15, 17, 22-29 and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wynne 5,900,299 in view of JP 2001-141179 and JP 2001-265138. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons of record. Applicant argues that disposing the fin on a low-temperature side of the heat-insulating surface of the vacuum insulator produces unexpected results, namely that the layers do not degrade even when a conventional film is used and the conductivity of the insulator does not increase significantly after five years of exposure. Initially it is noted that of the three independent claims pending, namely 15, 17 and 22, only claim 15 is positively directed to such a relationship of fin and heat source. Claims 17 and 22 do not positively recite the heat source, and therefore, do not positively define a relationship between heat source and fin or insulator. Thus, the above arguments directed to the position of the fin in relationship to the heat source are not relative or convincing with regards to claims 17 and 22. Concerning claim 15, applicant relies on the specification at page 12, line 23 through page 13, line 4 and page 14, lines 2-5 to show that the position of the fin in relationship to the heat source produces unexpected results. However, these sections of the disclosure do not include any

Art Unit: 1794

comparison between the prior art and the instant invention that would support the allegation of unexpected results. Specifically, regarding the heat conductivity results, there is no comparison of the instantly claimed invention to any prior art product or to the prior art set forth in the rejection of claim 15. Concerning the position of the fin, the disclosure at pages 12 and 13 does not show any unexpected results. The heat sealed portions, i.e. the fins of the insulator, shown in Wynne are folded so as to be on one side of the product, the other side would not have any heat sealed joints or fins; see the top surface shown in Figure 1. It would have been logical for one of ordinary skill in the art to position the side of the insulator with the heat sealed joints away from the heat source since the joint areas are most likely area to degrade and allow the vacuum to be compromised. In summary, it is a logical step to provide the side of the prior art insulator containing the fins away from the heat source and applicant has not shown any unexpected results that would overcome such an assumption.

3. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wynne 5,900,299 in view of JP 2001-141179 and JP 2001-265138 as applied to claims 15, 17, 22-29 and 32-35 above, and further in view of the Japanese patent document 107427/1990. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons of record and for the same reasons as set forth above in paragraph 2.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Thomas whose telephone number is 571-272-1502. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00 M-THUR.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Thomas/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794